UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,765	01/07/2002	Daniel Ahles	34250-1142	3190
	7590 04/27/200 D ASBILL & BRENN	EXAMINER		
999 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.			CAMPEN, KELLY SCAGGS	
ATLANTA, GA 30309			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/041,765	AHLES, DANIEL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	KELLY CAMPEN	3691				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Fe	ebruary 2009					
,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-82</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-30 and 40-82 is/are	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-30 and 40-82</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>31-39</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
		to by the Evaminer				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 January 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	A) □ Intern 1: 0	(PTO 442)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/31/2009</u> . 6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

The following is in response to the amendments and remarks filed 2/11/2009. Claims 1-82 are pending, claims 1-30 and 40-82 have been withdrawn.

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 31-39 recite a process comprising the steps of selecting and determining. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker* v. *Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane* v. *Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the

method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

A mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. In addition, insignificant extrasolution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. See *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 1-3, filed 02/11/2009, with respect to the 35 USC 102 (b) rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 102 (b) rejections of claims 31-39 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see page 4, filed 02/11/2009, with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections of claims 31-39 has been withdrawn.

With regards to the Objection to the Specification because the Abstract included purported merits, the amendments to the Abstract have overcome the Objection and the Objection is withdrawn.

With regards to the 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 31-39, the amendments do not overcome the rejection as the amendments are not directed to creating a tie to a statutory class in

Art Unit: 3691

a non trivial step. The tie to the processor is to a selecting step, an insignificant tie. As stated above, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. In addition, insignificant extrasolution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. See *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/041,765 Page 5

Art Unit: 3691

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KELLY CAMPEN whose telephone number is (571)272-6740.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kelly Campen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3691

/Kelly Campen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691